



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/571,299	03/10/2006	Andreas Hahn	2058.092US1	6243
50400 7590 03/04/2009 SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG & WOESSNER/SAP P.O. BOX 2938 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402			EXAMINER BEYEN, ZEWDU A	
			ART UNIT 2419	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 03/04/2009	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/571,299

Applicant(s)

HAHN, ANDREAS

Examiner

ZEWDU BEYEN

Art Unit

2419

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 December 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 03/10/2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/5508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

- This action is responsive to amendment dated 12/04/2008.
- Applicant's amendments filed on 12/04/2008 has been entered and considered.
- Claims 1, 6 and 9, are amended.
- Claims 1-16 are pending.
- The rejection to the 35 USC § 112 rejections is hereby withdrawn in view of Applicants' amended claims.
- Claims 1-16 stand rejected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

6. claims 1, 2, 3,4,9,10,11,12,14,15, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over applicant admitted prior art 'AAPA' (fig.1), and in view **Furukawa** (US20060036768).

Regarding claims 1, 9, 14, 15, and 16, 'AAPA' (fig.1) teaches a computer network system comprising: a plurality of client hardware elements forming a computer network (fig.1 cloud .114); a server network segment comprising a plurality of service (fig.1, cloud 112); and a router for interconnecting the computer network with the server network segment (fig.1 box.116); the computer network being assigned at least one first access address range (fig.1, IP-range 10.x.x.x).

the server network segment being assigned , the at least one third access address range (fig.1, IP-range 10.10.10.x) is a shared address range representing at least a sub-range of the at least one first access address range(fig.1, IP-range 10.10.10.x, in the server segment and the IP-range 10.x.x.x on the computer network segment are shared range), each of the plurality of services being assigned one access address within the shared address range (IP-range 10.10.10.x, in the server segment, each service have separate port number).

Though, 'AAPA' teaches a router with access list, it does not specifically teach where the router routes packets within the shared access address range and blocks packets from the

exclusive address range. Furthermore, 'AAPA' also does not specifically teach the server network segment being assigned at least one second access address range, wherein the at least one second access address range is an exclusive address range separate from the at least one first access address range.

However, in an analogous art, Furukawa teaches the server network segment/"external area of an IP network" being assigned at least one second access address range, wherein the at least one second access address range is an exclusive address range (**i.e. private address communication range**) separate from the at least one first access address range (fig.18, paragraph 102, discloses the addresses are subdivided into both the private address communication range and the non-private address communication range). In addition, Furukawa teaches a packet filter employed in an access control apparatus where packets are routed within the shared access address range (**i.e. non-private address communication range**) and blocked from the exclusive address range (**i.e. private address communication range**) ([0012]-[0013] discloses packet filtering that blocks communication with private address communication range and allow communication with non-private address communication range)

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of the 'AAPA' by assigning at least one second access address range on the server segment, wherein the at least one second access address range is an exclusive address range separate from the at least one first access address range and a filtering system to allow packets from the shared access range and to block packets from the exclusive

access address range, as suggested by Furukawa. This modification would benefit the system by providing additional security since the private addresses are not known to the external environment (see Furukawa, abstract).

Regarding claims 2, and 10, 'AAPA' (fig.1) teaches a computer network system according to claim 1, and 9 wherein the access address ranges are Internet Protocol address ranges (fig.1 shows an IP-range).

Regarding claims 3, and 11, 'AAPA' (fig.1) teaches a computer network system according to claim 1, and 9 wherein the server network segment is a LAN server (fig.1 shows a LAN server).

Regarding claims 4, and 12, 'AAPA' (fig.1) teaches a computer network system according to claim 1, and 9 wherein the computer network is a Local Area Network LAN or a Wide Area Network WAN (fig.1 a Local Area computer Network).

Regarding claim 6, 'AAPA' discloses a router for interconnecting a server network segment comprising a plurality of services with a computer network (fig.1, box.116)
the computer network being assigned at least one first access address range (fig.1,IP-range 10.x.x.x),

the server network segment being assigned , the at least one third access address range (fig.1, IP-range 10.10.10.x)is a shared address range representing at least a sub-range of the at least one first access address range(fig.1, IP-range 10.10.10.x, in the server segment and the IP-

range 10.x.x.x on the computer network segment are shared range), each of the plurality of services being assigned one access address within the shared address range (IP-range 10.10.10.x, in the server segment, each service have separate port number).

Though, 'AAPA' teaches a router with access list, it does not specifically teach where the router routes packets within the shared access address range and blocks packets from the exclusive address range. Furthermore, 'AAPA' also does not specifically teach the server network segment being assigned at least one second access address range, wherein the at least one second access address range is an exclusive address range separate from the at least one first access address range.

However, in an analogous art, Furukawa teaches the server network segment/"external area of an IP network" being assigned at least one second access address range, wherein the at least one second access address range is an exclusive address range (**i.e. private address communication range**) separate from the at least one first access address range (fig.18, paragraph 102, discloses the addresses are subdivided into both the private address communication range and the non-private address communication range). In addition, Furukawa teaches a packet filter employed in an access control apparatus where packets are routed within the shared access address range (**i.e. non-private address communication range**) and blocked from the exclusive address range (**i.e. private address communication range**) ([0012]-[0013] discloses packet filtering that blocks communication with private address communication range and allow communication with non-private address communication range)

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of the 'AAPA' by assigning at least one second access address range on the server segment, wherein the at least one second access address range is an exclusive address range separate from the at least one first access address range and a filtering system to allow packets from the shared access range and to block packets from the exclusive access address range, as suggested by Furukawa. This modification would benefit the system by providing additional security since the private addresses are not known to the external environment (see Furukawa, abstract).

Regarding claim 7, 'AAPA' teaches a router according to claim 6, the access address ranges are Internet Protocol address ranges (fig.1 shows an IP-range).

7. Claims 5, 8 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over 'AAPA', and Furukawa as applied to claims 1 and 9 above, in further in view of Lakshman et al. to (US5951651).

Regarding claim 5, the combination of AAPA-Furukawa silent on, a computer network system according to claim.1, wherein the router comprises a filter set up to block addresses from the second access address range and to let pass addresses from the third access address range.

However, in an analogous art, **Lakshman teaches** wherein the router comprises a filter set up to block addresses from the second access address range and to let pass addresses from the third access address range (fig.2, fig.3,col.3 lns.58-64,and col.4 lns.12-21, disclose a router and filtering rules that can be applied in the router to block or pass packets).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of the combination of AAPA-Furukawa by including filter in the router to block addresses from the second access address range and to let pass addresses from the third access address range as suggested by **Lakshman**. This modification would benefit the system by providing a fast destination or source address check up to facilitate a speedy communication.

Regarding claim 8, the combination of AAPA-Furukawa silent on a router according to claim 6, the router comprising a filter which is set up to block addresses from the second access address range and to let pass addresses from the third access address range.

However, in an analogous art, **Lakshman teaches** wherein the router comprises a filter set up to block addresses from the second access address range and to let pass addresses from the third access address range(fig.2, fig.3,col.3 lns.58-64,and col.4 lns.12-21, disclose a router and filtering rules that can be applied in the router to block or pass packets).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of the combination of AAPA-Furukawa by including filter in the router to block addresses from the second access address range and to let pass addresses from the third access address range as suggested by, Lakshman, for the same reasoning the examiner supplied in claim 5 above.

Regarding claim 13, the combination of AAPA-Furukawa silent on a method according to claim 11, further comprising the step of setting up a filter in the router in such a manner that the filter blocks addresses from the second access address range(s) and passes addresses from the third access address range(s).

However, in an analogous art, **Lakshman** teaches wherein the router comprises a filter set up to block addresses from the second access address range and to let pass addresses from the third access address range(fig.2, fig.3,col.3 lns.58-64,and col.4 lns.12-21, disclose a router and filtering rules that can be applied in the router to block or pass packets).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of the combination of AAPA-Furukawa by including filter in the router to block addresses from the second access address range and to let pass addresses from the third access address range as suggested by **Lakshman**, for the same reasoning the examiner supplied in claim 5 above.

Response to Argument

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 6, and 9 have been fully considered but are not persuasive

Applicant's argument:

- The combination of Figure 1 of the present application and Furukawa fails to disclose or suggest "the router being set up to route packets on the basis of respective addresses associated with packets being within the shared access address range" recited in claim 1.
- In Figure 18, the two address ranges in Furukawa are not shown to be associated with a server network segment.

Examiner response:

- Applicant discloses (paragraphs [0038]-[0039]) that the exclusive access address range being address range that can only be accessed internally in the server network and the shared access address range being address range that can be accessed from outside of the server network (which is clearly taught by Furukawa, fig.18, paragraph 102, discloses the addresses are subdivided into both the private address communication range and the non-private address communication range). The router set up to block communication that is directed to the exclusive access range, and only allow connection that is direct to the shared access address range (which is also taught by Furukawa, see [0012]-[0013] discloses packet filtering that blocks communication with private address communication range and allow communication with non-private address communication range).

- Regarding Applicant's argument that the two address ranges in Furukawa are not shown to be associated with a server network segment, the office action clearly stated that. Though, two address ranges in Furukawa are not shown to be associated with a server network, like the server network, one of the access address ranges in Furukawa is only internally accessible, while the other one is externally accessible.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ZEWDU BEYEN whose telephone number is (571)270-7157. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday, 9:30 AM to 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hassan Kizou can be reached on 1-571-272-3088. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Z. B./

Examiner, Art Unit 2419

/Hassan Kizou/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2419